

**From:** Charles Hixson  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/23/02 2:46pm  
**Subject:** No.

The settlement proposed is grossly biased towards Microsoft. They should not be so rewarded for their criminal activities.

The limitations imposed seem to be rather trivial considering the gross and severe and repetitive nature of the offenses. This is not the first time that Microsoft has engaged in monopolistic abuse. I don't believe that it's even the first time they have been convicted. And considering the amount of time and effort that needs to be expended to even bring such a mammoth beast to court, to impose a trifling penance is at best unwise.

A fair decision would break Microsoft into pieces, each one no larger than the largest of its remaining competitors (basically Apple Computer). I recognize that this is politically unacceptable, but this appears to be less than a slap on the wrist.

I suppose that it could be argued that Apple is basically a hardware company, in that case I would argue that the pieces of Microsoft should be no larger than the software division of Apple.

I have been quite offended by Microsofts blatant abuse of it's monopoly. I've also be somewhat injured, though just how much would, I admit, be difficult to determine. But I count perhaps 1/3 of the system crashes and lost data events as injury by Microsoft. I count perhaps 1/2 of the time spend fighting and recovering from computer viruses as injury by Microsoft. They have blatantly and persistently ignored pre-existing standards of good professional practice. They have cut corners in a way that would have put a contractor out of business quite quickly. They have sabotaged their competition in markets both large and small. They have leveraged monopolies in some areas into first advantage and then monopoly in other areas. They have misappropriated code, and when the owner complained, put them out of business. Etc.

Sincerely,  
Charles Hixson